



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

	Boston (and vicinity).	NEW ENGLAND.	NEW YORK CITY.	NEW YORK STATE.	PENNSYLVANIA.	NORTH.	WEST.	SOUTH.
celestial	4	9	27	16	17	10	28	19
don't you know	16	17	54	16	50	30	28	11
fortune	12	13	36	16	33	15	28	7
furniture	8	17	27	24	33	20	7	19
natural	4	22	36	16	33	10	7	15
nature	4	17	27	16	33	15	14	7
question	12	9	9	16	50	5	21	0
cordial	8	13	27	8	50	15	50	22
did you	8	26	54	32	50	45	28	26
educate	12	30	36	24	50	15	7	7
gradual	20	26	18	16	50	5	28	15
soldier	8	9	9	0	17	5	0	11
verdure	12	17	27	16	50	5	28	11
issue	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	4
sensual	4	0	0	8	0	10	7	7
this year	39	70	73	46	67	60	57	60
as yet	57	61	73	54	83	75	65	60
azure	8	4	9	8	17	20	21	22
casual	16	9	9	24	50	40	14	37
glazier	8	0	9	32	33	20	35	19
it does you good	43	48	54	54	83	50	57	52
usual	12	17	0	24	50	35	21	26
visual	16	22	9	32	50	30	28	26

To obtain a rough estimate of the practice all over the United States, I have made a general average of the foregoing figures, giving, however, three times as much importance to the North as to any other division:—

WORDS.

tʃ: 83½% ty: 16½% tʃ: 72% ty: 28%
dʒ: 82½% dy: 17½% dʒ: 64% dy: 36%
ʃ: 97½% sy: 2½% ʃ: 41% sy: 59%
ʒ: 77% zy: 23% ʒ: 41½% zy: 58½%

PHRASES.

The difference in treatment between the sy and the zy series is noteworthy. Perhaps it would have been somewhat less striking if I had used the common words *pleasure* and *treasure*.

In drawing inferences from these percentages, we must bear in mind two facts: in the first place, the persons consulted were mostly teachers; and, secondly, my calculation is based on their own uncorroborated testimony.

I think it would be safe to say that if the whole body of educated speakers in our country could be examined, without knowing it, by competent phoneticians, the proportion of ty, dy, zy (and sy in phrases) would be considerably smaller than that shown in my tables. But even accepting the figures as they are, do they not justify us in demanding that the early education of our children be relieved of some of its unattractive and unnecessary *featuryures*?

C. H. GRANDGENT.

Cambridge, Mass.

FRENCH PHONETICS.

- I. EDUARD KOSCHWITZ: *Les parlers parisiens* d'après les témoignages de MM. de Bornier, Coppée, A. Daudet, Desjardins, Got, d'Hulst, le P. Hyacinthe, Leconte de Lisle, G. Paris, Renan, Rod, Sully-Prudhomme, Zola, et autres. *Anthologie phonétique*. xxxii, 147 pp. Paris-Leipzig: H. Welter, 1893. Price, fr. 4.50 (m. 3.60).

THE best and most interesting parts of this valuable publication seem to me to be the introduction (thirty pages), and the notes preceding every phonetic text, informing the reader about the life and birthplace of nearly every one of Mr. Koschwitz's authorities, recording a few remarkable features of individual utterance and pronunciation, and stating exactly the time when, the manner in which, and the particular circumstances under which, his authorities—the different writers, poets, scholars, orators, and actors—happened to present themselves to him as subjects of phonetic observation. The learned professor of Romance philology at the University of Greifswald begins his introduction by quoting the well-known verses of the Artesian *trouvère* of the twelfth century, Quene de Bethune:

Por çou j'ai mais mon chanter en defois,
Que mon langage ont blasmé li François,
Et mes chançons, oiant les Champenois
Et la contesse, encor dont plus me poise,
La roïne ne fist pas ke courtoise,
Qui me reprist, elle et ses fuis li rois;
Encor ne soit ma parole françoise.
Si la puet on bien entendre en françois.
Ne cil ne sont bien apris ne cortois
Qui m'ont repris, se j'ai dit mot d'Artois,
Car je ne fui par norriz a Pontoise.

Starting from this significant and remarkably early linguistic document, he gives us a concise and instructive sketch of the history of *le français de l'Ile-de-France*, gaining more and more importance in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, and already recognized, without question, as the national language of the whole country in the fifteenth century, and of what was, and is, called *le bon usage* of this national French in regard to syntax, vocabulary and pronunciation—the ideal of teachers, grammarians, and lexicographers since the sixteenth century. *Le bon usage*, in syntax and vocabulary, became comparatively uniform and fixed very early in consequence of the art of printing, the sedulous work of linguistic theorists and theorizing authors, the French Academy, and the long classical period of French literature. These causes naturally had much effect also on pronunciation; they were supplemented by the powerful influence of a strong political centralization, and a great national capital containing a large population whose vernacular was, and is, very similar to the literary French on account of its origin. In truth, the *bon usage*, even in matters of pronunciation, has reached among the educated classes of France, in and outside of Paris, a higher degree of unity and stability than the national or literary language of any other country. Pronunciation, however, is more delicate, more flexible, more exposed to the centrifugal influence of dialectic, provincial and individual tendencies and, consequently, at the same time less easy to be controlled and regulated by the reason and will of man than the syntax and vocabulary of a living language. The latter, as is proved by the example of France, can be kept under an extraordinarily strict discipline and, seemingly at least, preserved almost intact for a considerable length of time by grammars and dictionaries, by an official orthography and traditional instruction, by the unyielding admiration and conscious imitation of unsurpassed models of numerous excellent classical writers.

The stability of the French written and spoken by the educated and learned classes has never been an absolute one, and if it appeared to be real in many respects for a long time after the classical period, even such an

apparent and relative stability did not outlive the beginning of the nineteenth century. We have witnessed, and are still witnessing, a great many changes going on in the national language of contemporary France, brought about by various political, social, and literary causes; among these may be noted the destruction of monarchy and the old aristocracy, the cessation of court-life, the disorganization of the old 'polite' society, democratic institutions, universal school-instruction, the intellectual rise of the middle and lower classes, and new aspirations and tendencies in literature requiring new forms and methods of expression. Accordingly, the *bon usage* in syntax and vocabulary—which, once believed to be firmly established, possessed a pretty clear and definite meaning—is now getting unsettled and seems to be drifting into a state of great uncertainty and vagueness. No wonder, then, that the *bon usage* in pronunciation (which, for obvious reasons, has never been and could never be quite clearly defined) has become more and more dubious and problematical.

What is the *bon usage* in pronunciation, and where is it to be found? It is *now* more difficult than ever (at least since the seventeenth century) to answer satisfactorily this question, which, already in former times, was a matter of eager dispute and very contradictory assertions among grammarians, lexicographers, orthoepists, and teachers, foreigners as well as natives.

"... De quel usage faudra-t-il rapprocher la règle? Je réponds: de *l'usage accepté comme bon à Paris, par le plus grand nombre des gens bien élevés*, des honnêtes gens comme on disait au grand siècle..."¹

"..... pour connaître le *bon usage*, il faut aller à Paris et y écouter les gens bien élevés, natifs de Paris même et aussi de la province, pourvu que ces provinciaux se soient corrigés de leurs imperfections dialectales.... Et si nous suivons les conseils des grammairiens anciens et modernes, nous nous y attacherons, faute d'une cour, surtout aux gens de lettres, aux savants, aux grammairiens, aux avocats, aux orateurs ecclésiastiques et aux comédiens."²

"... il est très difficile de définir qui appartient aujourd'hui aux gens bien élevés et

¹ Dupont-Vernon, quoted by Koschwitz, p. xvii.

² *Ibid.* p. xiv.

surtout qui n'y appartient pas. L'opinion générale est qu'il faut resserrer le cercle des autorités de langue. Mais même en nous bornant aux groupes que nous venons d'énumérer, il n'en est pas un seul dont l'autorité ne soit contestée. *Personne ne croit plus aux lexicographes et aux grammairiens. Les orthoépistes et les grammairiens se contredisent et se reprochent mutuellement leurs erreurs. Quant aux phonéticiens, il ne faut pas penser à les prendre pour guides.* Ils aiment trop le langage familier (!), et cela les égare (!?). De plus, nous l'avons vu, ils ne savent même pas si la prononciation des provinces ne vaut pas celle de Paris (!). . . .³

" . . . ce n'est pas aux phonéticiens de chercher et de définir le bon usage: leur tâche est plutôt de constater et de bien examiner toutes les prononciations existant dans les différentes classes et les différentes régions il est naturel que les phonéticiens préfèrent l'étude de la langue familière à celle du soi-disant bon usage. Ce n'est donc pas leur faute, si, ensuite, il se trouve des étrangers qui prennent leurs observations pour une révélation de la seule prononciation à suivre et adoptent ainsi la prononciation des voyous (!?) parisiens combinée, peut-être, avec le lexique des romanciers naturalistes les plus avancés."⁴

Mr. Koschwitz treats the question: "What is the *bon usage* in pronunciation at present, and where is it to be found?"—in a very lively and highly interesting manner throughout several pages and, sometimes, in an amusingly jocose and derisive tone; he apparently dislikes,—I know not why—a certain class of phonetists, whom he calls *les jeunes phonéticiens*. In the end, he tries to answer this difficult and intricate question, of course, but partially and provisorily, according to his own modest avowal (p. xxvii), by giving us in the book proper (pp. 1-135) the following texts with phonetic transcriptions, representing the pronounciation of the respective authors and actors consulted:

Alphonse Daudet, *La chasse à Tarascon*; Émile Zola, *La cathédrale*; Paul Desjardins, *Pauvre ménage*; Édouard Rod, *Journal intime*; Gaston Paris, *Les parlers français*; Ernest Renan, *Mort de Jésus*; Maurice d'Hulst, *Jeanne d'Arc*; Charles Loyson (P. Hyacinthe), *L'origine du déisme*; François Got, *Le mariage de Figaro* (par Beaumarchais), acte v, scène 3,—*Sganarelle* (par Molière), scène 17; Henri de Bornier, *La fille*

³ *Ibid.* pp. xiv-xv. ⁴ *Ibid.* pp. xii-xiii.

de Roland, acte i, scène 2; Silvain et Madame Bartet, *Grisélidis* (par Sylvestre et Morand), acte i, scène 10—acte ii, scène 3; François Coppée, *Pour ne pas vieillir*; Sully-Prudhomme, *Le lever du soleil*; Leconte de Lisle, *La véranda*.

Among Mr. Koschwitz's fifteen authorities, there are five Parisians by birth: Zola, Desjardins, d'Hulst, Coppée, and Sully-Prudhomme. The others, save Silvain and Madame Bartet, about whom no information is given in the notes, were not born in the capital; they are Parisians by adoption and domicile, excepting Rod, native of Nyon, Switzerland, who lives at Geneva. Two of them, Gaston Paris (Avenay, Marne) and François Got (Lignerolles, Orne), may, from a phonetic point of view, undoubtedly, be classed among the 'pure' Parisians even by the most fastidious critic, since they have resided at Paris from childhood or early youth. On the other hand, Zola, the son of an Italian, brought up at Aix-en-Provence, although born at Paris, cannot be considered a 'pure' Parisian in the same sense as the preceding; he belongs rather to the numerous class of 'Parisianized' southerners, *méridionaux naturalisés à Paris*, among whom we have to place also Daudet (Nîmes) and Henri de Bornier (Lunel, Hérault). Renan's birthplace is Tréguier, Côtes-du-Nord, in Brittany; Loyson was born at Orléans and educated at Pau, Basses-Pyrénées; and Leconte de Lisle is a native of Saint-Paul, île de la Réunion.

Mr. Koschwitz heard Monsieur Silvain and Madame Bartet recite the passages representing the pronounciation, respectively, of these artists—a dialogue and a monologue in verse—while they were playing the principal parts of Sylvestre and Morand's 'Mystère' on the stage of the Comédie-Française. The famous actor Got, in a private interview, was so kind as to recite for him, from memory, Beaumarchais' prose and Molière's verses. All the other names in Koschwitz's little book represent authors, poets, novelists, journalists, scholars, and pulpit-orators; they also favored him with a special *séance*, and read to him aloud their own works, prose and poetry, *always using a text* (cf. the notes), purposely speaking for the most part with deliberation and distinctness, allowing the listener plenty

of time to take or complete his notes, while doing their best to convince the foreign phonetist and highly esteemed or warmly recommended philologist that their pronunciation agrees exactly with the *bon usage*.

"Tous ces messieurs m'ont accueilli avec bienveillance et se sont exécutés avec la meilleure grâce du monde en me lisant, récitant ou déclamant des pièces de leur composition et choisies par eux ou proposées par moi-même. En les écoutant, j'ai inscrit sur mes *textes préparés d'avance les particularités* que j'ai pu saisir dans leur prononciation; des échanges d'idées sur des détails de prononciation et sur la meilleure manière de lire ou de déclamer des vers accompagnaient la lecture. Il va sans dire que, si l'occasion se présentait, j'ai observé mes 'sujets' quand ils parlaient en public, ignorant la présence d'un espion de leur prononciation. M. G. Paris qui comme M. Daudet me *lisait* un texte transcrit déjà par M. P. Passy, a bien voulu lire l'épreuve de son texte de sorte que, pour sa part, on a la *prononciation telle qu'il voulait (?) l'avoir* ou *qu'elle lui paraît (?) recommandable* et telle que je l'ai entendue. 5

M. G. Paris, après avoir vu ma figuration de son discours, *m'a proposé un si grand nombre de corrections intéressantes* qu'il m'a paru avantageux de les réunir en groupes et d'y joindre quelques réflexions qui expliqueront comment nous avons pu arriver fréquemment à des notations différentes des mêmes mots et probablement aussi des mêmes sons. Quelquefois, il y a eu certainement erreur de ma part. *Au lieu de préparer d'avance une notation figurée* du discours de M. G. Paris, composée selon les règles de l'orthoépique et individualisée à l'aide des observations faites antérieurement sur la prononciation de mon 'sujet,' *pour la corriger pendant l'audition*, je m'étais contenté, cette fois, *de prendre en main la transcription de M. Passy et d'y introduire les divergences de prononciation* que je pouvais saisir. Mal m'en a pris. La figuration de M. Passy répond si peu à la prononciation d'un *lecteur soigneux*. Ou M. G. Paris, en *relisant* notre passage, l'a prononcé *un peu autrement que dans la lecture* qu'il m'en avait faite l'an précédent, ou il a perçu quelquefois les mêmes sons autrement que moi. Quand on se lit à soi-même, pour se rendre compte de sa propre prononciation, *on s'observe involontairement*, et involontairement aussi on se rappelle et on se *règle sur les théories orthoépiques ou grammaticales* que l'on connaît et qu'on approuve. il ne se peut pas que M. G. Paris n'ait pas un *idéal de la bonne prononciation*, *qu'il réalise quand il a le temps de réfléchir*, mais *qu'il n'atteint pas toujours dans les*

5 Introduction, pp. xxvii-xxviii.

moments d'irréflexion. M. G. Paris doit avoir fait, en me lisant à haute voix, une petite pause après les mots cités [où il demande des liaisons], soit *pour me donner le temps de le suivre avec ma plume*, soit pour une autre raison. Il est impossible de ne pas *se tromper* quelquefois quand on transcrit *d'après une seule lecture*, et même *après une lecture répétée deux fois*. 6

I cannot help remarking that the title of Mr. Koschwitz's book 'Les parlers parisiens . . . , anthologie phonétique' is somewhat illusive and misleading. I, at least, understand and I believe one generally understands by *parlers parisiens* either the various dialects (not pronunciation alone!) spoken by different classes and groups of the Parisian population or (restricting the words to a particular meaning, rather forcibly, I think) the various modes of pronunciation used by one class or group of native or thoroughly naturalized Parisians; or by a certain number of individuals who belong to the same class or group on different occasions, for instance, in daily intercourse, in conversation with friends and relatives or with strangers, in a public speech, in lecturing, in instruction, and also (but by no means exclusively) in reciting something already prepared and committed to memory, and in reading aloud a written or printed text. The anthology, however, contains only specimens of the last two named kinds of the artificial standard pronunciation prevalent among nearly the same class of speakers, literary men and dramatic artists of distinction and reputation, Parisians in regard to language by birth, education, domicile, social communication, and imitation. It excludes and disregards entirely the other forms of their pronunciation, less artificial, more natural, nearer to popular speech, freer, easier, not restrained by the fetters of sight and memory, and not checked by a close observation of rules and a conscious pursuit of linguistic ideals.

Such a proceeding, on the author's part, is clearly opposed to what he seems to promise by the principal title of his book, and not quite in accordance with his orthoepic aims and views set forth in the introduction. But leaving out of consideration a certain number of evident or probable mistakes, some caused by

6 Appendice, pp. 139, 140, 143, 145.

Mr. Koschwitz's peculiar method of transcribing, others, perhaps, unavoidable and inherent in any mode of transcription, and a few eccentric and objectionable features of his system of phonetic characters (for instance, *u*, *i*, *ü* with diacritical marks=*ou ouvert*, *i ouvert*, *u ouvert*; *ouvert* in French!), I think the phonetic texts of the anthology represent pretty fairly and correctly:

I.—*The artificial pronunciation of good Parisian actors* [it does not matter whether they are Parisians by birth or not].

1. An excellent actor of the *old* generation, a veteran in his art, a staunch upholder of the old tradition of the *Conservatoire* and the *Comédie-Française*.

2. Two actors of the *same stage*, but belonging to the *younger* generation, and inclined to give way sometimes to the innovations and liberties of modern and popular, every-day speech, often pointed out as 'vulgar' and, therefore, blamed theoretically, but generally received in practice by the 'good society' of the present day.

II.—*The artificial pronunciation of prominent literary men reading their own works aloud, necessarily rendered more artificial by particular circumstances described above and recounted by Mr. Koschwitz himself.*⁷

During my frequent sojourns at Paris for the purpose of phonetic and orthoepic researches, I several times heard M. Got, M. Silvain and Mme Bartet recite on the stage; M. Loyson preach at his church; M. G. Paris and the late M. Renan lecture at the Collège de France, and I had the good fortune to collect for my own use a good many notes concerning the pronunciation of these *sujets* of Mr. Koschwitz's observation. An exact and careful comparison of his phonetic observations and mine, regarding the same individuals, would pass the proper bounds of an unpretentious critical account of the book before us. Besides, the reader may be assured I should not have anything important to add about the three actors. But I wish, and feel obliged, to

make a short remark about at least one of the scholars whose pronunciation is noted, M. G. Paris, whom I also heard speak very often in ordinary conversation as well as in free and informal instruction, both with and without written and printed texts. The pronunciation of this great scholar, no less distinguished by his profound erudition than by his courteous and elegant manner, so far as I know it, in conversation, giving instruction, lecturing, and even in reading notes and passages aloud during his lessons and lectures (*unconscious of being observed, and inattentive to orthoepic rules and prejudices*)—his pronunciation, I repeat, is very much like the 'natural' utterance of every well-bred Parisian on similar occasions. For example: comparatively rare liaisons; frequent assimilation from word to word, from syllable to syllable; frequent omission of *l*, especially after *i*, before a consonant and, particularly, before several consonants, *i plœ:r=il pleure*; frequently, *e*, beside *ë*, instead of *ε*, *me=mes*, *te=tes*, *se=ses*, *le=les*, *se=ces*, *me:ž=maison*, *desã:dr=descendre*, *egzakt=exact*, etc.

This representation very probably agrees, in many essential points of phonetics, also with the manner in which M. G. Paris delivered his speech on *Les parlers français* in the *Congrès des Sociétés Savantes* on May 26th, 1888. But there is no doubt, and it is not surprising at all, that it differs in a great measure from the pronunciation which, according to Mr. Koschwitz's transcriptions, Mr. Paris' corrections, and their mutual discussions (cf. notes and appendix, and see above), the orator used when he read from the text the same speech, on two different occasions, three or four years later; in the first place, observed and listened to by the German phonetist, and then, alone, observing and examining himself, and trying to make his pronunciation as 'natural,' as 'true,' and as perfect as possible by criticising himself and the phonetic representation. The result of such a procedure and so extraordinary conditions through which, and under which, the work of transcription was accomplished,—the result of so much intellectual exertion, meditation, discussion and exchange of opinion, could not be anything but a highly artificial pronunciation that, as the author

⁷ Also in this case, it is of little importance whether the authorities are natives of Paris or not, if we except a few provincial and individual peculiarities.

says, *se rapproche de la prononciation idéale, recommandée par les orthoépistes.*

For what class of students and teachers has Professor Koschwitz written his book? I suppose he wrote it principally for such as learn and know phonetics. As for the teachers who know phonetics, I am sure most of them are members of the "Association phonétique des professeurs de langues vivantes."

"Mais quand même le phonétiste a bien entendu, comment doit-il figurer les sons entendus? Il y a presque autant de systèmes de transcriptions phonétiques(?) que de phonétistes; ces systèmes doivent leur existence ou à des principes ou à des besoins différents, souvent seulement à la vanité puérile de leurs inventeurs."⁸

Why did Mr. Koschwitz not use for his transcription the international phonetic alphabet, agreed upon, adopted, and recognized as comparatively best for the purposes of instruction, by the members of the "Association phonétique des professeurs de langues vivantes," and tested practically for several years in the issues of the organ of this association, *Le Maître Phonétique*, and other publications?

I repeat and conclude: The 'Anthologie Phonétique' is a notable and important book, particularly on account of its introduction, notes, and appendix; it is, in reality, rather an orthoepical anthology and, as such, of great value for foreigners who like to study the artificial pronunciation of actors and literary men in reciting and reading aloud.

A. RAMBEAU.

Johns Hopkins University.

FRENCH WRITERS.

The Contemporary French Writers. Selections from the French writers of the second part of the nineteenth century. With literary notices, and historical, geographical, etymological, grammatical and explanatory notes. By Mademoiselle ROSINE MELLÉ. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1894. 8vo, pp. xvi, 212.

THE somewhat extended title of this volume in no way misrepresents the nature of its contents. We have seen so many studies and

⁸ Introduction, p. xxv.

excerpts of "Contemporary French Writers," which, when examined, stuck fast at the fateful year of 1848, or at their best could not survive the downfall of the Third Empire, that we had begun to doubt very seriously whether there were any actual contemporary French writers at all—at least in the eyes of the makers of text-books. But here we have the genuine article; we finally touch the promised land; its inhabitants rush to meet us; they are in truth alive, moving, talking, gesticulating, contemporary in fact—that is to say, most of them are contemporary. Taine, Renan, Flaubert, Feuillet seem a trifle deceased, passé, uncontemporary, to be absolutely frank; Jules de Goncourt survives in his inseparable brother, and it was not nature's fault that Guy de Maupassant failed to endure as a contemporary.

All of which does not intend to hint that the title of the book is not exact, for the explanatory title itself makes the allowed reservation in favor of the second part of the nineteenth century, and you cannot put your finger on any author in the list,—unless it be the precocious young Dumas—who got the ear of the public before the year of grace 1850. And to think that of these twenty-five contemporaries whom Mademoiselle Mellé has introduced to us, all but six still walk the Boulevard des Italiens and are welcoming the new order of life which the bankruptcy of Bignon has italicized! Such a correspondence between fact and theory has, perhaps, never before been met with in the annals of Modern Language Series.

And herein lies the value of the selections before us; they do represent current notions and style among the more prominent literary purveyors of France. Even Gyp's satires on the rising generation, and Barrès' reproduction of Symbolist idiocy are given their rightful place in the volume. When Zola is quoted, it is 'la Dérâcle' which supplies the lines; 'Rose et Noir' with Ohnet, 'Pâques fleuries' with Theuriet.

Of course, plenty of fault can be found with the character of the selections; no two people ever did agree in taste—or if two, no three, as witness the rule of Jesuit companionship. For instance, I admit that the shooting of